

## REMARKS

Claims 1-76 are pending in the case. Claims 74-76 are new. Claims 1, 26, 46, 57, 63, 71, 72, 74, 75 and 76 are independent claims.

The Office Action of June 6, 2004 objects to claim 7 as unclear. It rejects claims 1-13, 15-58 and 60-73 as obvious over Jecha in view of Dorfman. Claims 14 and 59 are rejected as obvious over Jecha in view of Mackman.

Regarding Jecha and Dorfman, the Office Action on Page 4 states:

"Jecha fails to explicitly disclose: transmitting, and rendering the page description file for the first time at the client. However, Dorfman teaches the use of a front end client to design customized PDF documents on a remote location or server. A local printer is used for the printing of a low resolution version of the pdf document located in the server. In other words, the pdf file in the server is sent to the local printer, where it is printed using a low resolution...Dorfman teaches the proofing of a pdf file by printing at a low resolution to a local printer, in order to determine whether any changes to the file are necessary before the final high resolution printing. This would provide the benefit avoiding time, and cost involved in reprinting the pdf file in a high resolution format."

These comments indicate that the Office Action considers the pdf file of Dorfman to be a low-resolution, proofing version. The final, high-resolution printing is not sent to the local printer.

Independent claims 1, 26, 46, 71 are amended to indicate that a high-quality description file is rendered for the first time at the client. Support for the use of "high-quality" is found in numerous places in the specification, including on page 13. In this sense, "high quality" refers to a page description file of the quality that will be used for final printing, as opposed to the "low-resolution" file for proofing that the Office Action describes Dorfman as having. As none of the cited references teach or suggest

transmitting a high quality page description file to the client, in combination with the other steps, withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

With respect to claim 57, this claim is recited in "means-plus-function" format. As is well-known, a "means-plus-function" element is limited to what is described in the specification and structural equivalents thereof. Jecha and Dorfman, combined, do not define all of the claim elements recited in the "means" format of claim 57, when viewed in light of the specification.

With respect to claim 63, the limitation of claim 69 is incorporated into claim 63, such that XML code is emulated with HTML code. This step of emulating XML code with HTML code is not suggested nor taught in the references. This step is special, in that the inventors have found a way to emulate the more advanced XML code with HTML code. Consequently, browsers that are enabled to use HTML code only can perform functions normally associated with XML. This allows the use of older, non-XML compatible browsers with the system as claimed, in personalizing and customizing documents. This is neither taught nor suggested by the cited references. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 63 and its related dependent claims is respectfully requested, as is the rejection of claim 69 and its related dependent claims for the same reason.

With respect to claim 72, the high quality page description file is built based upon instructions that the user provides on an interactive form. Claim 73 further defines that this high quality page description file is rendered at the client. Dorfman, as described by the Office Action, builds only a low-resolution file for proofing on the client. Consequently, the approach of claim 72 is different than that described in Dorfman, and is not rendered obvious thereby.

Claims 74-76 are new claims. Claim 74 and 75 include the limitation of rendering a high quality page description for the first time at the client and, as discussed above, the cited references neither disclose nor suggest this approach.

It is respectfully submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If there are any issues remaining to be resolved prior to receiving a Notice of Allowance, a telephone interview with the Examiner is requested prior to the issuance of a Final Rejection. Thank you.

A check is enclosed to cover a one-month extension of time to respond, which is hereby requested, and for the three additional new independent claims.

Respectfully submitted,

FULWIDER PATTON LEE & UTECHT, LLP

By:



Scott R. Hansen  
Registration No. 38,486

SRH:gbr

Howard Hughes Center  
6060 Center Drive, Tenth Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90045  
Telephone: (310) 824-5555  
Facsimile: (310) 824-9696  
Customer No. 24201

67942.1